



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Homer: An Introduction to the Iliad and the Odyssey. By R. C. JEBB.  
Boston, Ginn & Co., 1887. 202 pp.

All scholars, not only the initiated, but also those who have still to penetrate more deeply into Homer's demesne, will welcome the appearance of this volume, the fruit of a temporary departure from those more recondite studies which have rendered Prof. Jebb easily the first among English interpreters of Sophocles. We would fain believe that this book is an expression of that principle of retardation which, as was long ago remarked by Goethe, serves to enhance our aesthetic appreciation of an author; and in furnishing us with this most valuable Introduction to Homer, Prof. Jebb may but find his interest in the still unedited tragedies of his edition vivified by this association with the poet who has traced types of divine character for Sophocles.

It is a singular circumstance that the priority in the production of so comprehensive and yet so compact an Introduction should have been reserved for a country where the Homeric question has perhaps burned with less intensity than elsewhere. The literary temperament of English scholars, the aesthetic judgment of English poets, have alike militated in favor of "a master-hand at the centre of the work," as the late Principal Shairp expressed himself. In Germany there are volumes enough designed for the neophyte; but neither does Bonitz's admirable and popular essay (which, for some unexplained reason, Prof. Jebb has failed to mention, even in the translation of the late Prof. Packard), nor do W. Ribbeck's and other treatises assert so generous a range as this Introduction, which it is the merit of an English scholar to give to the world. Do the Teutonic Homerids take too keenly to heart the warning of Christ that the time has not yet come even for an Homeric grammar?

Perhaps to no one feature of this book is greater praise due than to this: it aims to be an *introduction* to Homer, and an introduction it is. Its author has resolutely turned aside from the temptations of expansion, which, we have no doubt, beset him at every hand with alluring persuasiveness. As an introduction, then, to the complete study of Homer, it deals with four aspects of the subject: (1) the general character of the Homeric poems and their place in the history of literature; (2) their historical value, as illustrating an early period of Hellenic life; (3) their influence in the ancient world, and the criticism bestowed on them in antiquity; (4) the modern inquiry into their origin. In the *Appendices* we find a somewhat lengthy discussion as to the form of the house at Tiryns; a catalogue of differences between the Greek of Homer and that of the classical age, and between the language of the Iliad and that of the

Odyssey; a list of words showing traces of the digamma, and a brief bibliography of the most important works on Homer and the Homeric question.

Originality is scarcely to be expected, nor is it desirable to any great extent in a volume whose aim is to record the march of Homeric study and to put firm ground beneath the feet of the beginner. We are content if we have placed before us in clear and concise English the fruits of the devotion of successive generations of scholars to this ever fascinating domain of philology, a domain which includes within its boundaries the germ of almost every other question incident to the study of ancient classical literature.

But it could scarcely be expected that the originality of a scholar of Prof. Jebb's fertility of resource in conjectural criticism should not force an opening in a field so inviting to the acumen of the investigator. Scottish soil has already given birth to Geddes' elaborate defense of the unique proposition that the *Iliad*, in the limited sense of Grote, and the *Odyssey* are the effort of but one and the same genius. Prof. Jebb has, it is true, not augmented the number of previous theories as to the origin of the *Iliad* by any theory distinctly original; yet he has opened up a mediating view, which is of interest and may commend itself to many.

The primary *Iliad* embraced books I, XI, XVI-XXII. Now, as there was no poetical necessity that book I should be followed immediately by XI, an opportunity for enlargement was presented, and II (without the *Catalogue*) to VII inserted. Again, a second horizon was opened up between XI and XVI. In this form, then, though expanded, the poem has preserved its simplicity. The bards who effected these insertions must have been conscious that interest is heightened by delay in movement. Next came VIII and IX with the duplication of the plot of the previous narrative. Then XXIII (to v. 256) and XXIV were appended because their inception lay dormant in the plot of the primary *Iliad*. That they are not by the author of the primary *Iliad* is apparent from their differences of language and of style. XXIV is certainly, to our thinking, an anticipation of the lyrical age, though Prof. Jebb goes so far as to regard IX and XXIV as the work of the same artist. Lastly come X and the greater interpolations.

The influence of Geddes' theory is seen in Prof. Jebb's inclination to accept as the birth-place of the primary *Iliad* the home of the hero whose personality dominates the "*Achilleid*." There is, however, an advance upon Geddes in confining the original *Iliad* to I, XI, XVI-XXII and not to I, VIII, XI-XXII. Now, if we put the question: How are we to account for the silence of Homer as regards the colonies in Asia Minor?—a question propounded by Mr. Monro in his paper in the *English Historical Review*, January, 1886—Prof. Jebb replies: The sustained resistance of the Homeric legend to the intrusion of patriotic anachronisms is to be explained on the supposition that the bulk of the poem had already been fixed in the greater lines before it arrived in Ionia.

The primary *Iliad* is, then, according to this view, Thessalian. The first series of additions (I-H) is, however, Prof. Jebb claims, Asiatic. What are the grounds, we may well ask, that indicate this transference of birth-place? Prof. Jebb contents himself with the statement that we can trace a personal knowledge of Asia Minor on the part of the poet, and that here we meet with the desire to enhance the lineage of Ionian houses by the glorification of Sarpedon and Glaucus, the leaders of the Lycians from the Xanthus.

In view of a theory recently put forward that Cyprus, not Asia Minor or Europe, is the birth-place of books Γ-H, it may be well to delay a moment in order here to collect the internal evidence from the books in question. No attempt can of course be made upon the present occasion to do more than outline some of the patent and latent sympathies of the author or authors of this episode. As might be expected, Geddes is here serviceable in disclosing the local mint-marks to be found in this splendid picture of the war generally, as Grote not unhappily called it. It must be confessed on the whole, however, that there is no such authoritative evidence in favor of any of the theories of birth-place as is claimed by their too zealous advocates.

### I. Asiatic Affinities :

1. Much has been made of Δ 275: ὥς δ' ὅτ' ἀπὸ σκοπιῆς εἶδεν νέφος αἰπόλος ἀνὴρ | ἐρχόμενον κατὰ πόντον ὑπὸ Ζεφύροιο ἰωῆς. Zephyrus in Homer is a storm wind, coming from the mountains of Thrace to the shores of Asia Minor. Compare B 147 and H 63: οἷη δὲ Ζεφύροιο ἐχέατο πόντον ἐπὶ φριξί | ὀρνομένοιο νέον, —; and in Δ 422 we have another simile: ὥς δ' ὅτ' ἐν αἰγιαλῷ πολυηχεῖ κύμα θαλάσσης | ὄρνυτ' ἐπασσύτερον Ζεφύρου ὑπο κινήσαντος. Though the argument drawn from the use of Zephyrus in these similes dates back to the time of Wood's *Essay*, its texture is extremely flimsy. Unsupported by other evidence, these passages prove absolutely nothing. All modern poetry teaches the power of self-localization on the part of the poet.

2. More definite is the allusion in Δ 141: ὥς δ' ὅτε τίς τ' ἐλέφαντα γυνὴ φοῖνικι μύθη | Μηονίς ἢ Κάειρα, —. Maeonia, the Lydia of later times, is referred to, Γ 401, together with Phrygia; but is not unknown to the author of B, K, and Σ, v. 291. In E 43 Idomeneus immortalizes a certain Phaestus, Μήμονος υἱόν, Βάρον, and the land is "lovely" even to the protesting Helen, Γ 401.

3. In Γ 189 Priam relates his encounter with the Amazons and the assistance rendered by him to the Phrygians. This affords the poet an opportunity of displaying some little acquaintance with Phrygia; in v. 187 the Sangarius is mentioned (as also Π 719), in v. 186 Otreus and Mygdon are named. The former is known to us from the Hymn to Aphrodite, v. 111. But Phrygia is very hazy; Ω 545 sharpens Γ 401 somewhat, but neither is the country nor its people (cf. also B 862, K 431) so well known as to force us to the conclusion that the poet must have lived in the Troad. Indeed, the shadowy character of the Amazons in Homer is not what we might have expected, since in Aeolis and Ionia, especially Ephesus, legends concerning them were most frequent; cf. Roscher's *Mythologie*, 273.

4. The mention of the Amazons leads us to their conquest by Belleroophon, Z 186, and the position occupied in book Z by the entire Glaucus episode. This episode is without doubt the strongest argument of the adherents that the birth-place of Γ-H was Asia Minor. It is clear from Hdt. I 147 that Glaucus was a name revered among the Ionians; his posterity became kings in Ionia. But I cannot but confess that it seems unwarrantable to build any superstructure upon an episode which is in glaring contrast with the preceding book. In E Diomed is endowed with the superhuman power of being able to distinguish a god from a man. With this compare Z 123, τίς δὲ σύ ἐσσι, ... ἀνθρώπων, and 128, εἰ δὲ τις ἀθανάτων ... εἰλήλουθας. In fact this immortal episode is without a home. Aristonicus has ἡ διπλὴ ὅτι μεταθίθεσσι τινες ἀλλαχόσε. Granted that it was designed to glorify the Ionic house of Glaucus, it is at least incautious to draw conclusions from this narrow episode as to the origin of Γ-H. Prof. Jebb himself holds that the passage Υ 217, which seems to speak in favor of Hissarlik, was added by some one desirous of celebrating the Aeneadae. Why is not this *a fortiori* the case with the Glaucus episode?

5. Doubtless the defenders of an Asiatic origin lay claim to the mention of Sidon, Z 291, Libya, implied in Γ 4, *φοινίξ*, Δ 141, Z 219, H 305, on the belief that the "adventurous Ionians" were the Humboldts of Homeric Greece. I can see no cogency in such a method of argumentation.

6. In Δ 53 Hera abandons to destruction the three cities devoted to her cult. This brings up the well-worn question: Is there in Homer any allusion to the overthrow of the Achaeans by a non-Achaeans people? It is introduced here solely because a new argument has recently been adduced in behalf of its affirmative answer. The affection displayed in this passage by Zeus for the old Troy of the Trojans, it is claimed, is to be taken as an indication of the love for the new Troy of the expelled Achaeans, and hence a direct allusion to the Doric invasion. It seems best, however, to exclude all reference to post-Achaeans times. There was no overthrow of Argos at best, and the hegemony over Greece merely found a new habitation in Sparta.

7. *ἐν Λακεδαιμονίᾳ αὖθι*, Γ 244, can scarcely be elevated to an argument for the home of the poet; nor Γ 49, *ἐξ ἀπὸς γαίης* (cf. A 270) in the mouth of Hector. If the γῆ Ἀπία with its initial *ā* in Aeschylus likewise refers to the Peloponnesus as *the land of water*, we have rather a distinctively Peloponnesian appellation, and one that could scarcely have come into existence in the new home of the Achaeans.

8. Lamos is the name of one of the ancients upon whom Helen's beauty had such a dread effect. But there is nothing to compel us to Fick's assumption (*Ilias*, p. 245) that this Lamos was probably eponymous of the later city of *Λαμπόνηα* or *Λαμπώνειον*. Fick himself seems to have become convinced of the invalidity of this suggestion (p. 394).

9. Geddes has drawn too taut his argument as to the differentiation between *Ὀλύμπιος* and *οὐρανός*. The invocation to Zeus—*Ἰδὼθεν μεδέων*—in the mouths of the Greeks as well as of the Trojans, is accounted for on his view by the suggestion that Olympus has been drawn out of the visible diurnal sphere in these books of the *Iliad*, which he claims are herein on a plane with the "Ionic" *Odyssey*. But in E 750 both *Ὀλύμπιος* and *οὐρανός* occur in conjunction; and even if Geddes' argument were admitted as cogent, it disproves strictly only the Thessalian origin of Γ-H.

10. Allusion to legends that relate to the Troad are not numerous, and may easily be paralleled by similar Peloponnesian affinities. We find, for example, allusion to the artificers of the ships of Paris who were unacquainted with the oracle of the gods (E 59-64); with this cf. Tychios, the maker of Ajax' shield, H 220; to the steeds of Anchises (E 271); the sons of Phaenops slain, E 152; Laodice is mentioned only Γ 124, Z 252 (the other Laodice I 145, 287).

11. References to the *φηγός* are more frequent in these books (E 693, H 22, 60, Z 237, and in the later I 354); but it is also found Φ 549. The Scamander is called *ἡφείες* in E 36 alone, but similar epithets are found in Φ and X. Its junction with the Simois is mentioned E 774, Z 4, and the priest of the Scamander E 77. The Simois is brought to our mind's eye Δ 474-488, E 774, 777, Z 4, and also M 22, Υ 53.

## II. *European Affinities:*

1. Undeniable is the prominence and sympathy given to Helen in these books. Of the forty occurrences of her name in the *Iliad* no less than twenty-five instances fall to the share of Γ-H, if we regard mere numerical appearances (Γ 15, Δ 2, Z 5, H 3: B 4, Θ 1, I 3, Δ 3, Ν Τ Χ Ω each 1). Furthermore, the honorific epithets heaped upon her in this "primitive addition" are in striking contrast to the indifference or antagonism to her charms displayed in the "*Achilleid*" or the remaining portions of the

poem. Achilles is content with nothing less than *μυγεδανή*, T 325. Helen is specially characterized as "the lady of Argos" nine times in the Iliad, and of these I-H claim five (T 458, Δ 19, 174, Z 323, H 350—the remaining occurrences are in the late books B 161, 177, I 140, 282). Hera, the tutelary deity of Argos, shares with Helen alone this proud epithet (in Δ 8). Helen in her noblest and in her weakest moment is filled with longing for lovely Lacedaemon. Does not all this indicate the clear-cut sympathies of a Peloponnesian bard?

2. Prominence of Diomed in E, Z (*Διομήδους ἀριστεία*). Though there are no special landmarks in E pointing to the Peloponnesus, the supreme glory of Tydeides indicates no slight predilection in favor of an Argive hero. Perhaps no hero rises to the height attained by Diomed in the fifth Iliad; his glory is so great that Nemesis has marked him for her own (Aegialeia, E 412). Little importance is to be attached to the mention of Mekisteus, father of Euryalus the friend of Diomed (Z 28, cf. B 566, Ψ 678), but the opportunity to recount the legend of Tydeus (Δ 378) was not neglected, as if in anticipation of the still more glorious deeds of his more glorious son in the following book. It is Diomed who speaks the proud words H 400-402: *μήτ' ἄρ τις νῦν κτήματ' Ἀλεξάνδροιο δεχέσθω | μήθ' Ἑλένην γυνῶν δέ, καὶ ὅς μάλα νηπίος ἐστίν, | ὥς ἤδη Τρώεσσαν ὀλέθρου πείρατ' ἐφῆπται*. The poet or poets who composed I-H preferred Peloponnesian to North Greek heroes. It will not suffice to account for this fact by taking refuge in the withdrawal of Achilles from the scene, admitting that the poet was making a conscious enlargement between the first part of B and Λ. Eurypylus, Odysseus, and Polypoetes are the only exceptions to the long list of Peloponnesian heroes. The former is a Thessalian, but he is connected by close ties with the Argives, as was his cousin Phoenix. It is not till Λ and Θ that he rises to his chief glory; in E and Z he is content to slay his man. Not a single Thessalian chief is pointed out to Priam by Helen from the walls, nor is any Thessalian mentioned in the personal circuit of Agamemnon. With the glory of Diomed is clearly associated the rise of Sthenelos, who declines from this point on. Deipylus occurs only E 325. Finally, it may be noted that an Aetolian enjoys the fame of being the only hero slain by a god (E 842).

3. When Hector issues his challenge to the Greek host, nine heroes rise to confront him, and in the following order: Agamemnon, Diomed, the Ajaces, Idomeneus, Meriones, Eurypylus, Thoas, and Odysseus. Agamemnon stands here (H 180) as elsewhere throughout these books, in the foreground. In the Teichoscopy he is the first descried by Helen, as he is the cynosure of the eyes of the poet. In Δ he claims our attention by his review. In Z he ruthlessly hews down Adrestus whom his more tender brother had wished to spare. His attendant Eurymedon is carefully distinguished from the charioteer of Nestor. Agamemnon's commanding position, it may be urged, followed as a matter of course during the voluntary absence of Achilles. But in the Achilleid it is Ajax, not Agamemnon, who awakens our sympathies. Whether as Achilles' cousin (a relationship unknown to the Iliad) he holds his great place in the Achilleid is doubtful; he was, however, half a Peloponnesian on his mother's side. In Γ 229, Z 5, H 211, however, and here alone, Ajax is called *ἑρκος Ἀχαιῶν*. The duel scene with Hector is but a reflex of that between Alexander and Menelaos. On Ajax cf. Geddes, 113ff. It can scarcely be denied, I think, that the sympathies of the poet are unreservedly Peloponnesian. Even Geddes, a stout believer in the Asiatic source of B-H, is compelled to acknowledge that the heart of the poet is in the south and east of Greece.

5. Legends of the Peloponnesus: Polyneices, Eteocles and the Cadmeiones, Δ 370ff.; Aegialeia, the wife of Diomed, E 412; the story of Tydeus, E 800; the allusion to Sisyphus, Z 153; the battle at the Celadon, H 124-160. Legendary touches appealing to the sympathies of a Peloponnesian are singularly frequent in these books.

6. Ἄργος is called πολυδίψιον in Δ 171 alone; Ἄργος ἱππόβοτον, Γ 75, 258, Z 152, but also B 287, I 246, O 30, T 329, the latter two instances being more important from the earlier date of O and T. Ἄργος καὶ Ἀχαιοί, north and south Greece, in Γ 75, 258 alone, indicates a power of careful discrimination on the part of the poet. From H 363 it is clear that Argos is not limited to Argolis. Other touches of more or less importance may finally be noticed: the fountain Μεσσηγίς in Laconia Z 457, Ἀλαλκομενῆς Ἀθήνη Δ 8 = E 908 alone.

### III. Cyprian Affinities:

In his *Homerische Ilias*, published in 1885, Fick has advanced the hypothesis that Cyprus is the home of the books under discussion. He has not elaborated his views to any great extent, and, to my thinking, distinctly weakened his position by claiming as Cyprian the *Catalogue of Ships*.

Stasinus, or whoever it was that perpetrated the *Κυπριακά*, brings nearer to us the far-off island on the very outskirts of Hellenism. Epic poetry had its foothold there as in every well-connected region of the Greek world. That Homer should have been a Cyprian of course did not startle the ancients (Schol. B on Φ 12). He was in fact *μυριόπατρις*. In later days a civic edition called ἡ *Κυπρία* appears in the critical apparatus of the Alexandrians. But this is all more or less irrelevant. Granting all the cultivation of the epic in Cyprus, all the connection between Homer and Cyprus, which Engel has shown, the question is: have we any cogent reason for finding, just in this particular enlargement of the original design, traces of the influence of bards who lived and wrought in this centre of struggle between the elements of Phoenician and of Hellenic civilization, a struggle that lasted to the days of Isocrates' Evagoras?

Let us now call up the evidence that may be offered in defense of the unique proposition of Fick, which affects us with the hostility of surprise.

The connection between Cyprus and Phoenicia may be sufficient to account for the allusion to the Phoenician cult found in Homer. Supreme among these is the overshadowing influence of Aphrodite. The goddess of love is represented in Γ as the cause of the entire war. She is referred to in books III to V as frequently as in all the remaining books of the *Iliad*, not only as Aphrodite but also as *Κύπρις*, which name occurs in E alone. The name *Κύπρις* for Aphrodite does not, it may be remarked, occur on Cyprian inscriptions. Most singular, furthermore, is the reference to Dione (E 370) as the mother of the goddess. This Dione is certainly not Hera, the Dodonaean consort of Zeus and mother of Aphrodite, according to the popular belief of the Greeks. In the story which Dione recites to her daughter, wounded by the impetuous Diomed, she alludes to Otus and Ephialtes. Now, the scholiast on E 385 expressly says that Otus and Ephialtes were connected with the worship of Adonis and Mt. Lebanon. Ernst Curtius even maintains that the Dione of Dodona is a foreign deity, transplanted from the Orient.

Aphrodite's influence is more prominent in Γ-H than elsewhere. Adherents of the Cyprian theory will claim her activity as militating in their favor. But it is not till Y 307 that we meet with the prophecy that Aeneas' descendants shall rule over Troy. Aeneas is valiant enough in E to need the protecting arm of his mother; Alexander, *Veneris praesidio ferox*, dares to meet Menelaos.

Lycia and the Glaucus episode, the Solymi and Sidonians (cf. Z 290-2, also Ψ 743), might find an easier explanation in the nearness of Cyprus than in referring them to Ionic preferences. The *Καδμείοι* and *Καδμείωνες* are mentioned more frequently in Δ and E than elsewhere. The Arcadians, according to the legend the ancestors of the Cyprians, are alluded to, outside of B, in H v. 134 alone.

Other touches which might perhaps be referred to Cyprian influence are:

(1). The chariot battle in E. The Cyprians alone of all the Greeks in historical times made use of battle chariots. These are mentioned by

Hdt. V 113 in his recital of the contest of the Cyprians with the Persians, 505 B. C. It cannot be said that the *άρμα* is more prominent in Γ-H than in other books of the Iliad; but a *ἀρματοπηγός* is referred to in Δ 485 and nowhere else.

(2). In the same book (Δ 282) the forefathers of the Cyprians on Salamis are alluded to. In H 199 Salamis is glorified, cf. Hymn IX 4. A more distant reference to Salamis is the construction of the Trojan wall by Poseidon and Apollo (H 453). This story must have played a part in Cyprian legend, since Laomedon is obliged to expose Hesione to the monster sent by Poseidon to punish his treachery. Hesione becomes by Telamon mother of Teucer, the founder of Salamis. The expedition of the Perseidae is touched upon E 640, where it is said that Heracles with six ships laid waste the city of Laomedon. Laomedon is further mentioned in Z 23; his horses are extolled E 269, 640, and in Υ 236 his genealogical connections are introduced; in Φ 435ff. Apollo's service and the building of the walls referred to; Ψ 348 recalls E 640.

With the legend of Laomedon is connected that of Heracles, the rescuer of Hesione. His son Tlepolemus is a Rhodian, and an emigrant from Argos. The Lycian episode is drawn into the horizon of the Heracles legend by the death of Tlepolemos at the hands of Sarpedon (E 627ff.).

Passing by several other minor points of contact, we come to a very interesting feature in which Homer and Cyprus are in touch. I refer to the similarity between the Greek of Homer and that of the Cyprian dialect.

The points of correspondence limited to Γ-H and Cyprian are few in number:

*Κέραμος* E 387 occurs, it is well to be noticed, in the episode of Dione alluded to above. Dione begins her recital of the sufferings of the gods at the hands of mortals with the account of the binding of Ares by Otus and Ephialtes and his rescue from the *κέραμος* by Hermes. *Κέραμος* is primarily a large earthen jar; such jars were occasionally used as *δεσμωτήρια*; and Schol. D on E 387 says "the Cyprians call τὸ δεσμωτήριον, κέραμος": so also Eustath. 560, 2 and Et. Gud. The word occurs in this sense nowhere outside of this one passage.

The second word of peculiar interest is *ἀκοστήσας*, Z 506. ὥς δ' ὅτε τις στατὸς ἵππος, ἀκοστήσας ἐπὶ φάνη, δεσμὸν ἀπορρήξας θεῖη πεδίοιο κροαῖων. Hesychius has this gloss—ἀκοστή· κριθή παρὰ Κυπρίους. The possibility that the word is also Thessalian should, however, not be suppressed.

Other Cyprian words are not confined to these books. *ιδέ* is found outside of Homer in Cyprian alone, where it is a regular prose word for *and*. In the Iliad it appears Γ 194, 318, Δ 147, 382, E 3, 171, Z 4, 469, H 177. Furthermore, B 511, 585 MSS. S. L., 697, Θ 162, I 219 Eust., 658 = Ω 643, K 573, Λ 15, M 311 = Θ 162, N 432 = 165, 175, 348, Σ 589, T 285. And so it is with the Arcado-Cyprian termination of the infinitive *-ηναι*, etc. But on the basis of the retention of Homeric words in Cyprian, it is unphilological to assume a Cyprian origin for any part of the epos. This fact I have sought to bring out in this Journal above, p. 467, where I have discussed the retention in Cyprian prose of words that exist elsewhere in Homer alone, and in the *Transactions* of the American Philological Society, Vol. XVIII, where all the formal correspondences between Arcadian, Cyprian and Homeric Greek are adduced.

Is there any method of reconciling the three views which have been briefly alluded to above? From an examination of the internal evidence, any fair view will pronounce in favor, not of Asiatic, but of Peloponnesian or Cyprian sympathies. To hold with Fick, that about 4160 lines,<sup>1</sup> a third of our Iliad, is the work of a Cyprian is hazardous in the extreme. We may indeed accept the Dione episode as an interpolation from Cyprus, but here probability stops. Now, if the Cyprian sympathies of Γ-H can be reconciled

<sup>1</sup> Besides the *Ἰλίου οἶτος* Fick claims as Cyprian Θ 55-565, Δ 1-57, O 415-746, Y 1-380, Φ 385-513.



with the Peloponnesian preferences, we may marshal the two conjoined against the Asiatic theory with confidence.<sup>1</sup> There is here, then, a choice between two conflicting opinions, unless it can be demonstrated that the Peloponnesian-Cyprian sympathies of the legend reached Asia Minor in such unchangeable form that the poet had but a limited power over his material. I cannot but think that the true *via media* lies in the possibility of ties of kinship between the Tegean settlers in Cyprus and the Achaeans of the Peloponnesus. Tradition tells us that Paphos was settled by Agapenor, frustrate of his hope to reach his home after the fall of Troy. The *Nόστοι* represent the attempt to explain the kinship between the colony and its source. But we are not restricted to them alone. There is no ground for doubting that Arcadian emigrants may have reached Cyprus by way of Laconia, bearing with them the burden of Achaean song. Finally, in support of a suggestion that cannot be worked out here, Deecke has called attention in the *Berliner Phil. Wochenschrift*, 1886, p. 1324, to the worship of Apollo Amyklaos and Apollo Helotas, Spartan types of Apollo, in the island of Cyprus.<sup>2</sup> Tlepolemus, Glaucus, Sarpedon, Diomed (the mention of his wife Aegialeia occurs in the Dione episode), and even Ajax, are then all links between the mainland and the far-off colony. Lycia stands in no distant sympathy with the Peloponnesus. Lycians helped the chiefs of the Peloponnesus to fortify their citadels. The indirect proof of the existence of writing in Homer (*Z* 168, cf. *H* 175, 187, 189) points from Lycia to East Argos and to Laconia. The whole history of the Greek alphabet in Lycia, Phrygia, and doubtless Pamphylia, speaks in favor of Peloponnesian ties.

How far a poet, born in Asia Minor among the débris of a vast legendary past, may have been able to recreate Peloponnesian sympathies, is another question, and a vital one, into which we cannot here enter. It is time to turn to a further examination of the work before us.

The most rigorous critic cannot but pronounce this volume admirable in plan, scope, and execution. If there are objections to be offered, they are objections that deal solely with matters of detail. In view of the certainty of a second edition, it seems best to present to Prof. Jebb's kind consideration some matters of minor import, and, for the convenience of the readers of this Journal, to include some few corrections that may have been offered elsewhere.

Page 1: It is difficult to see on what ground the songs on Linus, etc., can be regarded as of Indo-European origin. If the true affinities of these songs are to be sought in the nature-worship of the Veda, the existence of similar songs in Semitic national life creates on the whole a safer point of departure than to relegate them to the most distant Orient. Whatever be the defects of his *Geschichte der griech. Lyrik* (and they are many), Flach has shown pretty conclusively that the Phrygian element in Greek poetry was ultimately Semitic.

Page 3: It is of course a mooted point whether there ever was a period when Hellenic tribes were still in passage from Asia to Europe. Aside from Penka and the dolichocephalites, comparative philologists at the present day seem more generally inclined to adopt a European origin for Aryan civilization. One of the most vigorous defenders of this view holds that the similarity of tribal and geographical names (and here the question is of more immediate import for the history of primitive Greek poetry) indicates that the Teucrians, Phrygians, Dardanians, Mysians, etc., all came

<sup>1</sup> After my examination of the evidence was completed, I noticed that Mr. Leaf has taken the same position in the *Classical Review*, 1887, No. 1.

<sup>2</sup> If the researches of Alex. Enmann (*Kypros und der Ursprung des Aphroditekultus*, in the *Mém. de l'Acad. Imp. de St. Petersburg*, VII series, vol. 34, No. 13) which have just appeared as a sign of the reaction against too much Orientalism in Greek, prove stable, we have to explain the Cyprian cult of Aphrodite as Hellenic. I cannot follow Enmann in his Hyakinthos-Kinyros theories, but it should not be suppressed here that the whole trend of his treatise is to draw Cyprus nearer to the Peloponnesus.

from Europe. Schrader has given his assent to the theory of European origin (*Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte*, p. 442), and now Brugmann (*Grundriss*, I 2) inclines to the same view.

Page 54 : The gradations : *family*, *φρατρία*, *φῦλον* savor more of the Attic than of the Homeric age.

Page 66 : Prof. Jebb states that the war-chariot had gone out of use in Greek fights before 700. The correctness of this assertion depends upon an answer to the question whether or not the Cyprians, who certainly did use the war-chariot in 505 B. C. (Hdt. V 113), preserved its original Hellenic use. That they may have borrowed it from the East is possible and perhaps probable, since Helbig has shown (p. 136) from a Cyprian vase in the British Museum that the Phoenician type of war-chariot obtained in Cyprus. The battle-chariot certainly was used in Asia Minor in the seventeenth century before Christ.

Page 87 : Geddes has here been followed without sufficient care. The passage quoted from Gellius II 11 (*ἐπὶ πόλεις διερίζουσιν*, etc.) as placed by Varro on a bust of Homer, is only found in the *recentiores codices* and *editiones veteres* (*sive omnes sive pleraque*), according to Hertz. In the same note, for the second *Chios* read *Rhodos*.

Page 88 : The earliest quotation from Homer is said to date from the sixth century. But the *ἐν δὲ τὸ κάλλιστον* is now generally referred to Simonides (or Semonides, as Choroiboscus and Et. Mag. 713, 17 write the name) of Amorgus, the contemporary of Archilochus. The pessimistic tone of the elegy is not far removed from that of the *Mirror of Women*. He certainly wrote elegies which need not be confined to the *ἀρχαιολογία*.

Page 94 : The younger scholar might have welcomed an attempt to distinguish between *διόρθωσις* and *ἐκδοσις*, though Ammonius and Didymus made no such distinction.

Page 121 : A mention of Nitzsch's complete change of opinion in the course of his Homeric studies might have been profitable.

Page 122 : For the history of the Grotian view as to B-H, it might have been interesting to note that Düntzer claims to have anticipated its author (*Abhandl.* 46, 292).

Page 132 : For *Rama* read *Rāma*.

Page 137 : *τεῖν*, *τῶν* in Homer are said to be Doric. But on what grounds will Prof. Jebb defend Dorisms in Homer? *ὠλεσίκαρπος*, κ 510, and *ἄμυς* seven times in our text, have long ago been set aside as false transcriptions. ξ forms from *δαίω*, *δνοπαλίζω*, *μερμηρίζω*, etc., are merely analogical formations to *ἐστήριξα*, etc. Cauer (*Sprachwiss. Abhandl. hervorgegangen aus Curtius' Grammat. Gesellsch.*, p. 149) ought not to have suggested the possibility of their Doric character—a view which, it must be said, he does not himself adopt. As long ago as 1843, Ahrens (II 252) disputed the Doric character of *τεῖν*. *τῶν* was called Doric by the grammarians solely because it had maintained itself in Doric alone (*τῶν*η·σβ. *Λάκωνες*; cf. Boeotian *τοῖν* and modern Cyprian *εσῶν*η).

Page 139 : For *γῶς* read at least *γῶς*; also p. 194. But even this is incorrect. *ὥς* alone is connected with Skt. *yas*. *ὥς* in *θεὸς ὥς* is *Ῥῶς* = Gothic *szē*.

Page 140 : The lack of any collective term to describe the dialects of the Aeolic type, since *Aeolic* has now been restricted in strict parlance to the dialect of Lesbos and of the adjacent mainland, has wrought a pardonable confusion here. On page 140 we read that "*F* kept its place in Aeolic far into the historical age" (which is far from being the case except we include Boeotian, Arcadian, Elean, etc.). On page 144 Aeolic is used in the correct

and limited sense, though it is scarcely true that *all* the Aeolic inscriptions are later than 400 B. C.

Page 143: Prof. Jebb thinks it very doubtful whether any of the eccentricities of our Homeric text are due to the μεταχαρακτηρισμός. But even Wilamowitz has to suspend his philippic against the *moderne Ignoranz* on this question and admit the possibility of false transcription. Despite his assertion that *ein attisch geschriebener Homer ist ein Unding*, the brilliantly aggressive author of the *Homericische Untersuchungen* can find no other explanation for Ὀρείθυνα and Πειρίθοος (cf. especially p. 324). In the note on p. 143 we miss any reference to Wackernagel's paper in Bezzenger's Beiträge, Vol. IV, as well as to the book of Wilamowitz alluded to. In a few instances Prof. Jebb might have been more liberally inclined to quote antagonistic views; e. g. Hinrichs has demolished the would-be polymath Sittl in his *Herr Dr. Sittl*, etc. (cf. pp. 82-97). And in reference to πίστερες and ἑμεις we cannot but think, whatever may be our opinion of his treatise on the Homeric dialect in Mahaffy's history, that Sayce is correct, and not Monro, in his article in the *Journal of Philology*, Vol. X 115, which is passed over in silence, though a direct reply to Monro's paper (IX, 260). Prof. Jebb himself rejects Monro's doubts as to the un-Aeolic character of πίστερες. It may be added that Fick has made the first attempt (though with doubtful success) to rescue the malodorous infinitives in -εειν (*Ilias*, p. 548) which Curtius, Renner and others explain by false transcription.

Page 146: It is interesting to note that Cauer, a determined opponent of Fick's views in the shape their author cast them, now finds as his deduction from Fick's investigations the important fact that words, parts of verses, even whole passages now preserved in Homer were once Aeolic and translated into Ionic. This is a significant departure from Hinrichs' generally accepted theory. See *Berl. Phil. Wochenschrift*, 1887, No. 19.

Page 191: ῥιγέω is \*σριγέω and not \*Φριγέω despite *frigeo*, cf. Pol. *s'raez'* New Sl. *srěž*, Lith. *strėgti*. ὁράω, οὐλαί, οὐτάω, οὐρανός are not necessarily examples of the total disappearance of F, since they may stand for ὀφράω, ὀφ'λαί, etc.

Page 195: It will be impossible, I think, to show that the ι of reduplication was ever originally long. In note 3, μήτι is called an *Ionic* dative. It cannot be specifically Ionic on any view, and it may be an instrumental. See Osthoff, M. U. IV 385.

Page 196: I think the remark that most of the vowels, which in Homer are of variable quantity, were originally long and were in process of becoming short (e. g. ἴσος, κᾶλός, φᾶρος), is too restrictive. It regards the change as purely of quantitative origin, thus refusing to allow any accentual influence as the cause of the shortening; nor does it admit the possibility of orthographical inaccuracies. ἴσος certainly does not belong here. The change is one between ἴσος and ἴσος, Skt. *vicu*. σσ becomes σ without shortening the preceding vowel. G. Meyer holds that κᾶλός is un-Homeric, and on φᾶρος consult Harder, *De alpha vocali apud Homerum producta*, p. 92.

It might have been interesting for the chronology of the Homeric question to have given the date of the *first* edition of Lachmann's *Betrachtungen* (1837).

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.